

M e m o r a n d u m

Date: October 12, 2010

To: Office of the Commissioner
Attention: Commissioner J. A. Farrow

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
Office of Inspector General

File No.: 010.11731.15989

Subject: FINAL 2010 COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE
SAN BERNARDINO AREA

I am issuing this final performance review report of the San Bernardino Area pursuant to Government Code (GC) §13887, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Audit Charter and CHP Audit Plan. The review focused on the operations of the command related to arrest reports, evidence and property, officer's monthly activity forms, manager and supervisor evaluations, ride-along program, special duty positions, unusual occurrence log, subpoenas and court attendance, daily field reports, secondary employment documentation of employees, inconsistent and incompatible activities statement documentation and the maintenance of substance abuse kits.

The inspection findings for the San Bernardino Area are as follows:

1. Eighteen out of 21 evidence items inspected, 86 percent, were contained in evidence bags that did not have the complete combination of initials, date and identification numbers on the seals.
2. Seven out of 11 evidence items inspected, 64 percent, which included controlled substances did not have both net and gross weights listed on the CHP 36, Evidence/Property Receipt/Report and/or the CHP 36B Evidence/Property Log.
3. CHP 100, Monthly Activity – Officers Evaluation/Activity Summary forms are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.
4. Four out of 30 CHP 112, Management Summary forms selected for review, 13 percent, could not be located.

Safety, Service, and Security

5. The Area Office Services Supervisor's CHP 120, Individual Development Plan for Future Job Performance of Permanent Employee forms were completed more than 30 days after her March 2008 and March 2009 anniversary dates and her CHP 120 form for the March 2010 anniversary date has not yet been completed.
6. The Area has not developed standard operating procedures (SOP) related to civilian ride-alongs.
7. Three out of 20 of the CHP 428, Release and Waiver of Liability forms reviewed, 15 percent, were not approved by the Area commander or other designated supervisor.
8. Four out of 20 of the CHP 428 forms reviewed, 20 percent, had a copy of the CLETS printout attached to the document.
9. The written tests for school bus driver applicants are not stored in a locked cabinet with restricted access.
10. The CHP 100E, Monthly Activity Report School Pupil and Farm Labor Safety form prepared monthly by the school bus officer is not reviewed by an Area supervisor prior to distribution to Division.
11. The CHP 234A, Rotation Tow Listing Application forms for contracted tow companies are not signed by the Area commander indicating approval.
12. Nine out of 20 subpoenas evaluated, 45 percent, did not have a corresponding CHP 415, Daily Field Record for the officer subpoenaed indicating they attended court.
13. Sixty-five percent of collision reports taken during the review period were made available to the public within eight days of the collision date.
14. Ten out of 20 CHP 415 forms reviewed, 50 percent, did not correctly document verbal warnings, motorists services or CHP 422, Vehicle Check/Parking Warning/Highway Damage Report forms. In the case of the verbal warnings, the documents did not contain the driver's license number of the violator and/or the reason for the contact. The license plate number or last six digits of the vehicle identification number were not recorded on the CHP 415 form for motorist services and CHP 422 forms.
15. The CHP 318 log reflected eight employees engaged in secondary employment; however, the expected duration of employment reflected on the three of the CHP 318 forms have expired and updated forms have not been prepared.
16. Three of the 10 personnel folders reviewed, 30 percent, contained a CHP 18, Receipt of Inconsistent and Incompatible Activities form with an incorrect revision date.

17. The substance abuse kits in the Area are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.

The San Bernardino Area commander agreed with the findings, and has taken corrective action to improve command operations. The commander's response is attached and is incorporated into this final report.

In accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* and Government Code §13887 (a) (2), this report, the response, and any follow-up documentation is intended for the Office of the Commissioner; Assistant Commissioner, Field; Office of Inspector General; Office of Legal Affairs; and Inland Division. Please note this report restriction is not meant to limit distribution of the report, which is a matter of public record pursuant to GC §6250 et seq. In accordance with the Governor's Executive Order S-20-09 to increase government transparency this report will be posted on the CHP internet website, and on the Office of the Governor's webpage, located on the State Government website.

Inland Division has reviewed the response submitted by the San Bernardino Area and agreed with the San Bernardino Area commander. As a result no further reporting is required by the San Bernardino Area and the matter is considered closed. The Office of Inspector General would like to thank the management and staff of the San Bernardino Area for their cooperation during the inspection.

If you have any questions, or are in need of additional information, please contact me or Lieutenant Paul Schroeder at (951) 486-2829.



R. J. JONES, Captain
Interim Inspector General

Attachment

cc: Assistant Commissioner, Field
San Bernardino Area
Inland Division
Office of Legal Affairs
Office of Inspector General

Memorandum

Date: September 20, 2010

To: Office of the Assistant Commissioner, Field

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
Inland Division

File No.: 801.10552.10734

Subject: RESPONSE TO 2010 PERFORMANCE REVIEW INSPECTION
REPORT – SAN BERNARDINO AREA

Attached is the response from the San Bernardino Area for the 2010 performance review inspection. The San Bernardino Area has adequately addressed all issues associated with the inspection and no further action is required.

Should you need any further information please contact the Inland Division Administrative Assistant, Lieutenant David Lane at (909) 806-2400.


J. P. TALBOTT, Chief



M e m o r a n d u m

Date: September 15, 2010

To: Inland Division

From: **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**
San Bernardino Area

File No.: 860.12533.11246

Subject: SAN BERNARDINO AREA – PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT

Attached is the corrective action plan for the Performance Review Report of the San Bernardino Area conducted July 13, 2010, through July 15, 2010. All findings requiring follow-up have been addressed, completed and/or remedied as required and are listed below. Copies of the Area S.O.P revisions have been attached for your perusal. Any questions regarding this plan should be directed to Lieutenant Robert Velasco at (909) 383-4247.

Finding #1 – Agree - Area has utilized briefing items and training days to remind officers and sergeants to check and sign the evidence bags with their initials, date and identification number.

Finding #2 – Agree - Area has utilized briefing items and training days to remind officers and sergeants to make sure that both the net and gross weights are listed on the CHP 36 Form for controlled substances.

Finding #3 – Agree - The CHP 100, Monthly Activity - Officers Evaluation/Activity Summary forms are now maintained in a locked file cabinet in which only the sergeants have a key.

Finding #4 – Agree - The CHP 112, Management Summary forms that could not be located, have recently been forwarded to the San Bernardino Area from the supervisors' previous command in headquarters.

Finding #5 – Agree - The Area Office Services Supervisor's CHP 120, Individual Development Plan for Future Job Performance has been completed. The Commander will be reminded by electronic mail in the future prior to the due date to prevent it from being over 30 days late.

Finding #6 – Agree - Area has developed Standard Operating Procedure 4.1.4, related to Area procedures for civilian ride-a-longs.

Finding #7, #8 – Agree - Area supervisors have been advised to make sure the CHP 428, Release Waiver of Liability Form has been signed by the commander or designee prior to the civilian ride-a-long. Additionally, Area supervisors have been advised to destroy the CLETS printout after reviewing it.

Finding #9 – Agree - The written test for school bus driver applicants, are now currently stored in a locked cabinet.

Finding #10 – Agree - The CHP 100E, Monthly Activity Report School Pupil and Farm Labor Safety forms are currently being processed to the Administrative Supervisor for review and signatures prior to its distribution to Inland Division.

Finding #11 – Agree - The CHP 234A, Rotation Tow Listing Applications are now being routed to the commander or their designee for approval prior to its distribution to Inland Division.

Finding #12 – Agree - Area has utilized briefing items, posted the court log and conducted impromptu court audits to ascertain why officers are missing court. Supervisors have been reminded to take corrective action.

Finding #13 – Agree - Area recently conducted a self audit for accident review. The audit revealed that officers on probation and those recently off probation had an extremely high percentage of reports that were not made available to the public within eight days. The Area assigned an Accident Review Officer to work weekends to assist and mentor the officers in collision investigations and time management skills.

Finding #14 – Agree - Area has utilized briefings and training days to remind officers to document the CHP 415, Daily Field Record in accordance with policy. Sergeants were advised via e-mail to verify the accuracy of the CHP 415, Daily Field Record.

Finding #15 – Agree - The Area Office Services Supervisor updated the CHP 318, Secondary Employment. Area supervisors have been reminded to update the CHP 318 during the annual evaluations.

Finding #16 – Agree - Area supervisors have been informed of the correct revision date of September 2003 for the CHP 18. All personnel folders have been updated.

Finding #17 – Agree - The Area's substance abuse kits are currently maintained in a locked cabinet in the sergeant's office.


E. L. FALAT, Captain
Commander

Attachment

**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR
GENERAL**



**2010 SAN BERNARDINO AREA
PERFORMANCE REVIEW**
(Original)

2010 SAN BERNARDINO AREA PERFORMANCE REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Section A..... | Exceptions Document |
| Section B | Inspection Checklist |

Section

A

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT
Page 1 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, and corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| TYPE OF INSPECTION <input type="checkbox"/> Division Level <input type="checkbox"/> Command Level <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive Office Level | | Total hours expended on the inspection: <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;">34.5</div> hours | <input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action Plan Included <input type="checkbox"/> Attachments Included |
| Follow-up Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Forward to: Office of Inspector General Due Date: | | |
| Performance Review: | | | |

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted a performance review of the San Bernardino Area. The review team arrived Tuesday, July 13, 2010, and completed their work Thursday, July 15, 2010. The following inspectors worked the corresponding hours as indicated below:

| Inspector | Number of Hours |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Officer R. Madeira, #15989 | 18.5 |
| Sergeant B. Gonsalves, #17044 | 14.5 |
| Lieutenant P. Schroeder, #11564 | 1.5 |
| Total Hours | 34.5 |

The review used the methodology described at <http://home.chp.ca.gov/acinspgen/oi> and consisted of examining 13 separate topics. The time period utilized differed in relation to the topic examined. The following topics and dates are indicated below:

| Topic Inspected | Dates Examined |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Arrest Reports | 07/01/2009 – 06/30/2010 |
| 2. Evidence/Property | 05/07/2009 – 07/13/2010 |
| 3. Monthly Activity - Officer's Evaluation / Activity Summary, CHP 100 | 12/01/2009 – 05/31/2010 |
| 4. Evaluations – Supervisors and Managers | 01/01/2008 – 04/31/2010 |
| 5. Ride-Along Program | 07/13/2009 – 07/12/2010 |
| 6. Special Duty Positions | 12/01/2009 – 05/31/2010 |
| 7. Rotation of Special Duty Positions | 01/01/2009 – 07/12/2010 |
| 8. Unusual Occurrence Log | 12/01/2009 – 05/31/2010 |
| 9. Subpoenas and Court Attendance | 12/01/2009 – 05/31/2010 |
| 10. Daily Field Report, CHP 415 | 12/01/2009 – 05/31/2010 |
| 11. Notice to Engage in Secondary Employment, CHP 318 | 01/01/2009 – 07/12/2010 |
| 12. Receipt of Inconsistent and Incompatible Activities Statement, CHP 18 | 01/01/2009 – 07/12/2010 |
| 13. Substance Abuse Kits | Current |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

FINDINGS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP

1. Eighteen out of 21 evidence items inspected (86 percent), were contained in evidence bags that did not have the complete combination of initials, date and identification numbers on the seals.
2. Seven out of 11 evidence items inspected (64 percent), which included controlled substances did not have both net and gross weights listed on the CHP 36, Evidence/Property Receipt/Report and/or the CHP 36B Evidence/Property Log.
3. CHP 100, Monthly Activity – Officers Evaluation/Activity Summary forms are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.
4. Four out of 30 CHP 112, Management Summary forms selected for review (13 percent), could not be located.
5. The Area Office Services Supervisor's CHP 120, Individual Development Plan for Future Job Performance of Permanent Employee forms were completed more than 30 days after her March 2008 and March 2009 anniversary dates and her CHP 120 form for the March 2010 anniversary date has not yet been completed.
6. The Area has not developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) related to civilian ride-alongs.
7. Three out of 20 of the CHP 428, Release and Waiver of Liability forms reviewed (15 percent), were not approved by the Area commander or other designated supervisor.
8. Four out of 20 of the CHP 428 forms reviewed (20 percent), had a copy of the CLETS printout attached to the document.
9. The written tests for school bus driver applicants are not stored in a locked cabinet with restricted access.
10. The CHP 100E, Monthly Activity Report School Pupil and Farm Labor Safety form prepared monthly by the school bus officer is not reviewed by an Area supervisor prior to its distribution to Division.
11. The CHP 234A, Rotation Tow Listing Application forms for contracted tow companies are not signed by the Area commander indicating approval.
12. Nine out of 20 subpoenas evaluated (45 percent), did not have a corresponding CHP 415, Daily Field Record for the officer subpoenaed indicating they attended court.
13. Sixty-five percent of collision reports taken during the review period were made available to the public within eight days of the collision date.

**COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Page 3 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

14. Ten out of 20 CHP 415 forms reviewed (50 percent), did not correctly document verbal warnings, motorists services or CHP 422, Vehicle Check/Parking Warning/Highway Damage Report forms. In the case of the verbal warnings, the documents did not contain the driver license number of the violator and/or the reason for the contact. The license plate number or last six digits of the vehicle identification number were not recorded on the CHP 415 form for motorist services and CHP 422 forms.
15. The CHP 318 log reflected eight employees engaged in secondary employment, however, the expected duration of employment reflected on the three of the CHP 318 forms have expired and updated forms have not been prepared.
16. Three of the 10 personnel folders reviewed (30 percent), contained a CHP 18, Receipt of Inconsistent and Incompatible Activities form with an incorrect revision date.
17. The Area's substance abuse kits are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.

ARREST REPORTS

Objective:

- Review of the articulable facts of probable cause related to ten arrest reports for 148(a)(1) PC and ten arrest reports for 647(f) PC in the described timeframe, in order to ensure adherence to departmental policy and pertinent laws. Assess the application of associated departmental policy and compliance by Department employees.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

- The Area had a total of 2206 arrest reports during the review period. Thirty-nine arrest reports were for 148(a)(1) PC and 26 were for 647(f) PC. The combined 148(a)(1) PC and 647(f) PC arrests reports accounted for 2.95 percent of all arrests. Ten reports for 148(a)(1) PC and 10 reports for 647(f) were reviewed.
- One out of ten of the 148(a)(1) PC reports reviewed (10 percent), did not articulate sufficient probable cause to justify the arrest. Specifically, the narrative did not articulate the person delayed, resisted, or obstructed the officer in such a way as to prevent the officer from continuing with his investigation of a possible DUI driver.
- One out of 10 of the 148 (a)(1) PC reports reviewed (10 percent), articulated a violation of Miranda Rights. Specifically, the report documented the suspect was asked a question related to the charge after being placed in custody and before being advised Miranda

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 4 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

rights. When Miranda rights were advised, the subject declined to answer any questions and requested an attorney.

- Seven out of 10 of the 148(a)(1) PC arrest reports reviewed were filed by the District Attorney. Five of those are pending a disposition by the court and two had a final disposition of guilty. The remaining three arrests are still pending a filing by the District Attorney.
- Nine out of 10 of the 647 (f) PC arrest reports reviewed were filed by the District Attorney. Four of those are pending a disposition by the court, three had a final disposition of guilty and two cases were dismissed. The remaining arrest is still pending a filing by the District Attorney.

EVIDENCE / PROPERTY

Objective:

- Review and sample 21 evidence/property numbers focusing on drugs, guns, and money entering the evidence system from the time of the last evidence inspection conducted by OIG to the time of this review to verify the command is in compliance with applicable departmental policy and to ensure the continued integrity of the system.

Findings:

- Eighteen out of 21 evidence items inspected (86 percent), were contained in evidence bags that did not have the complete combination of initials, date and identification numbers on the seals.
- Seven out of 11 evidence items inspected (64 percent), which included controlled substances did not have both net and gross weights listed on the CHP 36, Evidence/Property Receipt/Report and/or the CHP 36B Evidence/Property Log.

Observations:

- Four evidence items inspected required a property letter be sent to the owner, however, a property letter was not issued for one of the four items (25 percent).
- One out of three evidence items inspected that included money (33 percent), did not reflect two persons counting the money on the CHP 36 form.
- All CHP 36 forms for items containing guns included e-trace and Automated Firearms System documentation.
- All evidence was located and quarterly audits are being conducted.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 5 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

- The sign-in sheet for the evidence room was reviewed and is being utilized according to current policy. Additionally, the sign-in sheet indicated the Area commander had been in the evidence room four times since the evidence inspection by (OIG) in May of 2009 as well as a spot check by the Division chief which demonstrates pro-active involvement in the evidence/property system.

MONTHLY ACTIVITY - OFFICERS EVALUATION / ACTIVITY SUMMARY, CHP 100

Objective:

- Review 20 CHP 100 forms to verify processing at all levels is being completed timely and in accordance with applicable policy and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for performance comments/ratings.

Findings:

- CHP 100 forms are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.

Observations:

- Eight out of 20 of the CHP 100 forms reviewed (40 percent), did not contain initials by a supervisor indicating a fifteen-day review had been completed.
- Seven out of 120 CHP 100 forms randomly selected for review could not be located.
- All CHP 100 forms reviewed contained rater's and reviewer's comments and were completed in a timely manner.

EVALUATIONS – SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

Objective:

- Review supervisor's and manager's evaluations for timeliness and to ensure they are being completed as directed by applicable policy. Review six CHP 112, Management Summary forms to ensure they are completed as directed by policy.

Findings:

- Four out of 30 CHP 112 forms selected for review (13 percent), could not be located.
- The Area Office Services Supervisor's CHP 120, Individual Development Plan for Future Job Performance of Permanent Employee forms were completed more than 30 days after

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 6 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

her March 2008 and March 2009 anniversary dates and her CHP 120 for the March 2010 anniversary date has not yet been completed.

Observations:

- One out of 10 CHP 118S, Performance Appraisal – Sergeant forms reviewed (10 percent), was completed more than 60 days beyond the end of the calendar year.
- Employee files including officers, sergeants and lieutenants are maintained in a single filing cabinet and are accessible to non-uniformed staff as well as all sergeants.
- All CHP 112 forms reviewed were completed according to policy.

RIDE-ALONG PROGRAM

Objective:

- Review and evaluate the application of departmental policy including local SOP for civilian ride-alongs. Verify the use of the CHP 428 form to ensure accuracy and consistency in support of the effort to increase safety and reduce liability. Review pertinent documents and systems to verify that supervisors are conducting quarterly ride-alongs with officers.

Findings:

- The Area has not developed SOP related to civilian ride-alongs.
- Three out of 20 of the CHP 428 forms reviewed (15 percent), were not approved by the Area commander or other designated supervisor.
- Four out of 20 of the CHP 428 forms reviewed (20 percent), had a copy of the CLETS printout attached to the document.

Observations:

- All twenty CHP 428 forms evaluated did not reflect the purpose of the civilian ride-along.
- The Area maintains a log posted in the sergeant's office for the purpose of documenting officer's ride-alongs.
- Ride-alongs are not being conducted per Area SOP which requires quarterly ride-alongs for officers.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 7 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

SPECIAL DUTY POSITIONS

Objective:

- Review functions of the VIN Officer, School Bus Officer/Coordinator (SBOC), and Tow Officer. Verify these positions are administered effectively in accordance with departmental policy, "best practices," and SOP to verify departmental value along with system integrity.

Findings:

- The written tests for school bus driver applicants are not stored in a locked cabinet with restricted access.
- The CHP 100E form prepared monthly by the school bus officer is not reviewed by an Area supervisor prior to its distribution to Division.
- The CHP 234A forms for contracted tow companies are not signed by the Area commander indicating approval.

Observations:

- The Area SOP does not contain procedures for voiding VIN labels.
- All numbered and un-numbered VIN labels are accounted for.

ROTATION OF SPECIAL DUTY POSITIONS

Objective:

- Review selection criteria, staffing levels, assignments, and rotation to evaluate the tenure of the current position holders and adequacy of SOP to address the duration and distribution of these positions.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

- The Area has SOP establishing a minimum of two years and a maximum of four years in which an officer can remain in a special duty position. The Area SOP has allowances for the maximum time to be extended at the discretion of the Area commander.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 8 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

- The special duty positions have been occupied by the current officers for the following time periods:
 - The current SBOC officer has been in the position for one month.
 - One of the current accident investigation review officers has been in the position for one year. The other has been in the position for under one year.
 - The current court officer has been in the position for one year.
 - The current evidence officer has been in the position for one year.
 - The current front desk officer has been in the position for two months.
 - The current tow officer has been in the position for six months.
 - The current VIN officer has been in the position for six months.
 - The current training officer has been in the position for one year.
 - The current public information officer has been in the position for one year.

UNUSUAL OCCURRENCE LOG

Objective:

- Review 20 twenty-four hour periods during the evaluation period and evaluate for accuracy, timeliness, and consistency in accordance with SOP, "best practices," and departmental policy.

Findings:

None.

Observations:

- The Area utilizes an Access based program designed specifically for the San Bernardino Area. The program allows for two separate logs. One which is secure in that only sergeants, lieutenants, and the Captain have access to add information. The other log allows the same access but includes officers-in-charge. Area SOP outlines what information should be contained in the log.
- A review of 20 random days during the review period revealed the log is being utilized properly. Appropriate levels of response by supervisors to high profile incidents are recorded, as well as necessary notifications.

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

SUBPOENAS AND COURT ATTENDANCE

Objective:

- Review 20 total subpoenas and evaluate local procedures to verify compliance with laws and departmental policy to determine the effectiveness of the system and court attendance of departmental employees.

Findings:

- Nine out of 20 subpoenas evaluated (45 percent), did not have a corresponding CHP 415, Daily Field Record for the officer subpoenaed indicating they attended court.

Observations:

- Seven out of 11 CHP 415 forms reviewed (64 percent), lacked proper documentation for court attendance. This information is considered 'best practice' and includes: court name, case number, defendant's name, charge, and verdict.
- The Area does not have a system in place to track and follow-up on missed court appearances.
- The Area's supervisors regularly attend court to review officer's testimony, appearance, and demeanor. Their observations are documented on each officer's CHP 100 form as well as the sergeant's monthly CHP 112.

DAILY FIELD REPORT, CHP 415

Objective:

- Review and evaluate 20 calls for service, traffic collision investigations, and other related incidents in the previous six months to verify the accuracy, thoroughness, and effectiveness of the documentation process by departmental employees. Determine the timeliness in which traffic collisions are completed and available to members of the public.

Findings:

- Sixty-five percent of collision reports taken during the review period were made available to the public within eight days of the collision date.
- Ten out of 20 CHP 415 forms reviewed (50 percent), did not correctly document verbal warnings, motorists services or CHP 422, Vehicle Check/Parking Warning/Highway Damage Report forms. In the case of the verbal warnings, the documents did not contain the driver license number of the violator and/or the reason for the contact. The license

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 10 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

plate number or last six digits of the vehicle identification number were not recorded on the CHP 415 for motorist services and CHP 422 forms issued.

Observations:

- One of 20 (five percent), of the traffic collisions reviewed was recorded as a "motorist service."
- All of the arrests documented on the reviewed CHP 415 forms were entered into the Area Information System (AIS).

NOTICE TO ENGAGE IN SECONDARY EMPLOYMENT, CHP 318

Objective:

- Review forms in conjunction with the associated logs and selected personnel files focusing on accuracy, timeliness, and compliance with applicable policy to reduce departmental liability resulting from potential conflicts of interest.

Findings:

- The CHP 318 log reflected eight employees engaged in secondary employment, however, the expected duration of employment reflected on the three of the CHP 318 forms has expired and updated forms have not been prepared.

Observations:

- The Area secondary employment log contains all required information.

RECEIPT OF INCONSISTENT AND INCOMPATIBLE ACTIVITIES, CHP 18

Objective:

- Review completion of forms and verify the form revision date to ensure compliance with departmental policy.

Findings:

- Three of the 10 personnel folders reviewed (30 percent), contained a CHP 18, Receipt of Inconsistent and Incompatible Activities form with an incorrect revision date.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 11 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

Observations:

- All of the CHP 18 forms reviewed contained all required signatures.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE KITS

Objective:

- Review the current substance abuse kits and determine the availability, expiration date, and security of the kits as required by departmental policy.

Findings:

- The Area substance abuse kits are not maintained in a locked cabinet or a room with controlled access.

Observations:

- Both substance abuse kits are sealed and contain all required items.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 12 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madelra, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |

Commander's Response: ☒ Concur or ☐ Do not concur (Do not concur shall document basis for response)

Please provide response in the form of a CHP 51, Memorandum.

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM
EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT
Page 13 of 13

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Chapter: Performance Review |
| Inspected by: Officer R. Madeira, Sergeant B. Gonsalves and Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 - 07/15/10 |

Required Action:

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

Please provide response in the form of a CHP 51, Memorandum.

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8, for appeal procedures.) | Commander's Signature:  | Date: 9/7/10 |
| | Inspector's Signature:  | Date: 07/23/10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewer discussed this report with the employee. <input type="checkbox"/> Concur <input type="checkbox"/> Do not concur | Reviewer's Signature:  | Date: 9-20-10 |



Section

B

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| Command: San Bernardino | Division: Inland | Number: 860 |
| Evaluated by: Officer R. Madeira | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 |
| Assisted by: Sergeant. B. Gonsalves Lieutenant P. Schroeder | | Date: 07/13/10 – 07/15/10 07/15/10 |

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statutes, or deficiencies noted in the review shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Type of Inspection: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive Office Level | | Lead Inspector's Signature:  | |
| Follow-up Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Inspection | Commander's Signature:  | Date: 07/07/10 |
| Note: A "Yes" response indicates full compliance with policy. If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. | | | |
| Questions 1 through 11 pertain to the review of Arrest Reports. | | | |
| Consider the following when reviewing arrest reports: | | | |
| "Probable cause to arrest is a set of facts that would cause an officer or citizen of similar training and experience of the arresting officer or citizen to form an honest and strong belief that the individual has committed a crime, based on the totality of the circumstances." | | | |
| "Reasonable suspicion is a set of specific and articulable facts that leads an officer to reasonably believe that a crime is occurring, is about to occur, or has occurred, and that the person detained is connected to that activity which is criminal in nature. A detention is an exertion of authority that is something less than a full arrest, but more substantial than a simple contact or consensual encounter." | | | |
| Reference: HPM 81.5, Drugs Program Manual, Chapter 1 G.O. 100.91, Search and Seizure Policy | | | |
| 1. For the determined time period, how many 148(a)(1) PC arrests did Area personnel make? | 39 | | Remarks: |
| 2. Identify the individual who has made the most arrests for 148(a)(1) PC. Of the reports reviewed, determine the total arrests (and the percentage) this employee is responsible for. | 3 each | | Remarks: Four officers each conducted three arrests: One in the 13000 series, two in the 16000 series and one in the 18000 series. |
| 3. For the determined time period, how many 647(f) PC arrests did Area personnel make? | 26 | | Remarks: |
| 4. Identify the individual who has made the most arrests for 647(f) PC. Of the reports reviewed, determine the total arrests (and the percentage) this employee is responsible for. | 4 | | Remarks: One officer in the 19000 series conducted four arrests. |
| 5. For the determined time period, what percentage of the total number of arrests were for 148(a)(1) PC and 647(f) PC? | 2.95% | | Remarks: 2.95% (65 of 2206 total arrests). |
| 6. Are supervisors signing page one of the reports, verifying they are reviewing the reports for content, compliance with policy, and accuracy prior to filing the report with the court or district attorney? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| 7. After examining the chronology of events in the arrest report narrative, were the rights of the arrestee honored by not being asked incriminating questions prior to being Mirandized or being asked questions related to the crime after they invoked their Miranda rights? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Refer to report number 201000750 dated 05/15/2010. See exceptions document for further. |
| 8. Does the arrest report articulate the officer's seizure of any property/evidence? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 9. Does the arrest report articulate a legal basis to seize items taken? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 10. Of the reports selected for review, how many resulted in a conviction? | 5 | | | Remarks: 148(a)PC- seven out of 10 cases were filed, two were found guilty and five are pending. Three other cases are pending court filing. 647(f)PC- nine out of 10 cases were filed, three were found guilty and four are pending and two were dismissed. One other case is pending court filing. |
| 11. For each arrest report inspected and related to the charge(s) of 148(a)(1) PC or 647(f) PC, are the conclusions of the arresting officer supported by articulated facts to support the arrest? <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p>Assaultive</p> <p>Non-Compliant</p> <p>Resistant</p> <p>Matched description</p> <p>Officer Safety</p> <p>Area</p> <p>Suspicious activity</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p><u>Facts</u></p> <p>Specific verbal threats or statements, furtive movements, boxer's or fighting stance, rapidly closed distance, clinched fists, lunged or grabbed at officer, scanning the area.</p> <p>Specific statements such as "I'm not going to jail", ignored commands, acted contrary to commands, walked away, illogical responses.</p> <p>Pulled away, folded arms, became rigid, attempted to hide, unresponsive to physical force.</p> <p>Height, weight, clothing, gender, race, hair, color, vehicle description, direction of travel.</p> <p>Weapons, physical size, putting hands in pockets, characteristics of being armed, proximity to weapons, time of day.</p> <p>Number and type of arrests, personal observations, citizen's complaints, statistics.</p> <p>Unusual appearance for area (heavy coat in summer), unprovoked fight, looking in vehicles.</p> </div> </div> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Refer to report number 201000750 dated 05/15/2010. See exceptions document for further. |
| Questions 12 through 20 pertain to the Evidence/Property System review | | | | |
| 12. Is the "Chain of Possession" section of the CHP 36, Evidence/Property Receipt/Report, completed for all movements of the evidence/property? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 13. Are the net and gross weights of controlled substances or suspected controlled substances recorded on the CHP 36 and CHP 36B, Evidence/Property Log, and in the Area Information System (AIS)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Seven out of 11 evidence items inspected that included controlled substances did not reflect net weights and/or gross weights on the CHP 36 and/or the CHP 36B. |
| 14. Do the CHP 36 forms contain an officer-in-charge or supervisor's signature, date, or initials, indicating the document and/or the evidence had been reviewed for compliance? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 15. Does the evidence supervisor conduct quarterly inspections and annual inventories of the evidence/property system, placing an emphasis on guns, drugs, and money, while following the procedures outlined in HPM 70.1, Evidence Manual? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 16. Were all items associated with the evidence numbers selected for inspection located? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 17. Are items consisting of guns, drugs, and/or money being routinely purged as set forth in HPM 70.1, Evidence Manual? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The need for this was not encountered. |
| 18. Does the commander ensure evidence/property is not left in temporary lockers more than one day, excluding weekends and holidays? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 19. Is there documentation to support management's proactive involvement with their Area's evidence/property system? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area commander is listed on the sign-in sheet for the evidence room on four separate occasions during this review period. |
| 20. If necessary, has the commander taken proactive steps to meet with the district attorney(s) to coordinate and improve the purging process of evidence items? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: This has not become a necessity. |
| Questions 21 through 30 pertain to Personnel's Monthly Activity review | | | | |
| 21. Is the CHP 100 form, Officer's Evaluation/Activity Summary being utilized by all officers regardless of assignment? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 22. Are officers completing a CHP 100 form for each calendar month of the year? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Seven CHP 100 forms were not located for the review period. |
| 23. During the period being recorded on the CHP 100 form, is the form accessible to both the officer and supervisor(s)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 24. Are 15 day reviews being conducted by supervisors on the CHP 100 forms? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Eight out of 20 CHP 100 forms did not include 15-day comments. |
| 25. During the end of the month review, are all applicable critical task ratings being completed by the supervisor(s)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 26. Are critical task ratings of "Excellent" or "Needs Improvement" supported with comments by the supervisor documented on the CHP 100 form? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 27. Does the command's Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) outline procedures for the timely completion of CHP 100 forms? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 28. Are all signature blocks on the CHP 100 form completed? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 29. Are completed CHP 100 forms for the current year for individual officers maintained in separate files by the supervisors? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 30. Are the CHP 100 forms secured in a locked file after the review process? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The filing cabinet the CHP 100 forms are kept in has a lock, but it is not used because the key cannot be located. |
| Questions 31 through 45 pertain to Evaluations review | | | | |
| 31. Does the command's SOP outline procedures for the timely completion of CHP 112, Management Summary forms? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 32. Are sergeants completing a CHP 112 form every calendar month? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Four CHP 112 forms were not located. |
| 33. Are raters reviewing the CHP 112 on a regular basis and providing monthly ratings on all appropriate critical tasks at the end of each calendar month? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 34. Are reviewers examining and initialing the completed CHP 112 at the end of each calendar month (and at any other time deemed appropriate)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 35. During the period when comments are being recorded on the CHP 112, is the form maintained in a location available to both the sergeant and his/her immediate supervisor and inaccessible to non-supervisory personnel? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 36. Is the CHP 118S, Performance Appraisal – Sergeant, being completed, signed, and processed within 60 days following the end of each calendar year? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: One CHP 118S form was completed 90 days after the end of the calendar year. |
| 37. Are probationary sergeants receiving performance appraisals at the end of four, eight, and 12 months? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: This does not apply to anyone at the Area. |
| 38. Is the CHP 118MM, Performance Appraisal – Middle Manager, being completed, signed, and processed within 60 days following the end of each calendar year? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 39. Are probationary managers receiving written performance appraisals at the end of four, eight, and 12 months? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are no probationary managers assigned to the Area. |
| 40. Is the CHP 118N, Performance Appraisal – Motor Carrier Specialist II, being completed, signed, and processed within 30 days following their promotional anniversary date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are none assigned to the Area. |
| 41. Is the CHP 118P, Performance Appraisal – Motor Carrier Specialist III, being completed, signed, and processed within 60 days following their promotional anniversary date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are none assigned to the Area. |
| 42. Is the CHP 118PSDS1, Performance Appraisal – Public Safety Dispatch Supervisor I, being completed, signed, and processed within 60 days following their promotional anniversary date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are none assigned to the Area. |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 43. Is the CHP 120, Individual Development Plan for Future Job Performance of Permanent Employee, completed within 30 days following the employee's anniversary date of appointment in the current job classification? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The CHP 120 forms for the Area OSS1 were completed more than 30 days after her March 2008 and March 2009 anniversary dates. The March 2010 CHP 120 has not yet been completed. |
| 44. Is the STD 636, Report of Performance for Probationary Employee, completed every two months, four months, and six months for employees serving six-month probationary periods? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are no employees currently on probation. |
| 45. Is the STD 636 completed every four months, eight months, and 12 months for employees serving 12-month probationary periods? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: There are no employees currently on probation. |
| Questions 46 through 54 pertain to the Area's Ride-Along Program review | | | | |
| 46. Has the command developed SOP to ensure ride-alongs within their Area are in accordance with GO 100.42, Ride-Alongs and HPM 70.16, Recruitment Program Manual, Chapter 13? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area SOP does not address civilian ride-alongs. |
| 47. Is a CHP 428, Release and Waiver of Liability, form being completed for all non-CHP employee ride-along participants prior to the ride-along? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 48. Do the command's CHP 428 forms explain the purpose of the ride-along(s)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The CHP 428 does not indicate this information. |
| 49. Are the CHP 428 forms being retained for one year? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 50. Is the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) being used to obtain record checks on individuals who wish to ride-along with an officer? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: A copy of the CLETS printouts were attached to four of the 20 CHP 428 forms reviewed. |
| 51. Are all ride-along requests being forwarded and reviewed by the Area commander or his/her designee prior to the ride-along taking place? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Three of the CHP 428 forms did not have a supervisory signature approving the ride-along. |
| 52. Does the Area have an SOP for quarterly supervisor ride-alongs with officers? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area SOP calls for quarterly ride-alongs with officers. |
| 53. Are shift supervisors participating in at least a one hour ride-along per year with officers? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 54. Does the Area have an established system in place for recording supervisor ride-alongs? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| Questions 55 through 58 pertain to Special Duty positions review | | | | |
| 55. Does the Area have a SOP for the duties related to the VIN (Vehicle Identification Number) officer? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 56. Does the Area's SOP contain procedures for voiding VIN labels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area SOP does not address VIN voiding procedures. |
| 57. Does the Area comply with departmental policy for voiding VIN labels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 58. Does the Area retain copies of the memorandums documenting VIN labels being voided? How long are the memorandums being retained? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: CHP 51, Memorandums for voided VIN plates dating back to January 2007 were located. |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| 59. Are replacement VIN plates requisitioned from Field Support Section (FSS) using a CHP 41, Supply Requisition form or a CHP 97A, Monthly Inventory Control Replacement VIN plates (Bland Un-Numbered) form form? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The CHP 97A is used to requisition replacement VIN plates. |
| 60. Is the Commander or designee signing the CHP 41 form? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The CHP 97A is used and is signed by the commander. |
| 61. Did the VIN Officer complete the CHP 97, Monthly Inventory Control Replacement VIN plates, Pre-numbered form, and the CHP 97A, at the end of each month and ensure the Commander signs both? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 62. Did the VIN officer complete either a DMV Reg. 124, Application for Assigned Vehicles Identification Number Plate, or DMV Reg. 256, Statement of Facts, for every VIN plate issued by the command, and attach these documents to the CHP 97B, VIN Paperwork Reproduction Master form? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 63. Are the replacement VIN labels (both numbered and un-numbered) kept in a locked location? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 64. Are the non-issued blank un-numbered and pre-numbered VIN plates on hand at the Area accounted for? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 65. Does the Area's backup VIN officer have keys to the locked drawer/cabinet where the VIN labels are kept? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 66. Does the Area have a SOP for the School Bus Officer/Coordinator (SBOC)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 67. Has the SBOC attended the required annual training hosted by Division? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Training was attended 11/16/2009 |
| 68. Does the Area have trained backup personnel for the SBOC position? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 69. Are CHP 295H, Driver Certificate Log(s), being maintained for the current year plus three years? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 70. Does the CHP 295H form contain the required information as indicated below? | | | | Remarks: |
| • California Special Driver Certificate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • DL-45 number | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • The DL-45 issue date | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • The applicant's name or drivers license number | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • The type of certificate (e.g., original-SB, renewal-FL, or duplicate-SP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • The total fees collected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • The initials of persons transferring the fees collected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • Any other notations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| 71. Is the SBOC completing a CHP 295E, Applicant Reference form for each applicant file? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 72. Are the CHP special certificates and tests stored in a locked cabinet that has restricted access? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The special certificates are secured but the school bus tests are not. |
| 73. Other than the SBOC, who has access to the certificates? | | | | Remarks: The Area OSS1 has sole access to the special certificates. |
| 74. In the event an applicant fails a test, are there procedures in place to ensure the applicant receives a different test upon re-examination? (Explain what these procedures are in the "Remarks" section) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The SBOC examines the CHP 295 in the applicants file to determine which test(s) were previously recorded as having been taken and chooses from the remaining test(s) that have not yet been selected. |
| 75. Is a CHP 100E, Monthly Activity Report, School Pupil and Farm Labor Safety, completed each month by the SBOC? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 76. Is a supervisor reviewing the CHP 100E form each month? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The CHP 100E is forwarded directly to Division. |
| 77. Does the Area have SOP for the Tow Officer? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 78. Does each tow company have its own file containing a valid Tow Services Agreement (TSA) signed by the commander? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The TSA is not signed by the Area commander however, the Area commander issues a CHP 51 to the approved tow company with her signature. |
| 79. Has the Area conducted, at a minimum, one annual open enrollment meeting with the tow companies to discuss any issues with the forthcoming TSA? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The open enrollment meeting took place March 12, 2010. |
| 80. Does the Area maintain a tow complaint file? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 81. Does the Area retain the records for any disciplinary action taken against a tow company? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 82. Does the Area conduct an annual inspection of each tow company's primary and secondary storage facility? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 83. Is the primary storage facility address for each tow company the same as the business address on the CHP 234 form? If not, is the business address listed as a secondary storage facility on the CHP 234 form? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| Questions 84 through 92 pertain to the Rotation of Special Duty positions review | | | | |
| 84. Does the Area have SOP establishing a minimum/maximum time an officer can remain in a special duty position? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area SOP has a two year minimum, a four year maximum and allowances for extension of the maximum at the discretion of the Area commander. |
| 85. Are special duty personnel being rotated according to the established SOP guidelines? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 86. Has the SBOC been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 87. Has the VIN Officer been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 88. Has the Tow Officer been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 89. Has the AI Officer(s) been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 90. Has the Court Officer(s) been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 91. Has the Evidence Officer been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 92. Has the Front Desk Officer been in his/her respective position for more than the allowable time period? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| Questions 93 through 98 pertain to the Unusual Occurrence Log review | | | | |
| 93. Has the command developed SOP to ensure Area personnel follow notification policies and procedures as contained in GO 100.80, Report of Unusual Occurrence? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 94. Has the command established an Area specific unusual occurrence log to document high profile/threshold, reportable incidents? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 95. Does the unusual occurrence log document supervisor(s) and manager(s) presence at high profile or threshold events? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 96. Are employees making entries in the unusual occurrence log as required? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 97. Does the Area SOP outline procedures requiring supervisors to regularly review and evaluate the information documented in the unusual occurrence log? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 98. Are controls in place to restrict access to the unusual occurrence log? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| Questions 99 through 105 pertain to Subpoenas and Court Attendance review | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 99. Does the immediate supervisor or designee serve copies of subpoenas to employees? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 100. Does the Area have a process to ensure proper service of subpoenas? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 101. Does the command's SOP outline the following: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area SOP does not outline the requirement of court case disposition on the CHP 415 form. |
| • Service of the subpoenas? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • Clerical filing of served subpoenas? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • Court appearance? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • Court attendance? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • Disposition requirement of court case on CHP 415, Daily Field Record? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| 102. Do supervisors routinely attend court proceedings to observe court attendance, proper attire, testimony, and demeanor of Area officers? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 103. Does the Area have a system in place to monitor court attendance/testimony by employees? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The Area does not have a system in place to monitor court attendance. |
| 104. Do CHP 415 forms contain the final disposition of cases in the notes section? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Seven out of 11 CHP 415 forms did not reflect case disposition. |
| 105. Does the Area have a system in place to track the final disposition of cases filed by the Area and is follow-up conducted on missed court appearances? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: The disposition of criminal cases in documented by the court officer. The Area does not have a system in place to follow-up on missed court cases. |
| Questions 106 through 109 pertain to the CHP 415, Daily Field Record review | | | | |
| 106. Have reports been entered into AIS, Area Information System, for all activity listed in the "Primary Activity Code" section of the CHP 415 requiring a report? A list of these activities are listed below: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| • 202, DUI Arrest | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • 216F, Felony Arrest-Non-DUI | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • 216M, Other In Custody Arrest-(Misdemeanor, Non-DUI) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • VTROLL, Rolling Stolen Vehicle | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • 555I, Accident Investigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| • 555R, Accident Report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| 107. Are 90% of collision investigations/reports available to the public within eight working days of the incident's occurrence? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: 65% of collision reports are available within eight working days. |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 108. Is the "Notes" section of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on the left side of the CHP 415, including who pre-approved it? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 109. Is the required information being included in the "Comments" section of the CHP 415, as listed below? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Verbal Warning (Verbal)</u>. The section violated, and driver's license number shall also be recorded. If no driver's license is available, obtain the individual's name and date of birth. If neither of the above is available, obtain the vehicle identification number or license plate number. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Ten out of 20 CHP 415 forms did not document all required information for verbal warnings, motorists services and issued CHP 422 forms. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Motorist Service (MS)</u>. The vehicle license number shall also be recorded. If no vehicle information is available, the vehicle verification number or the last six digits of the vessel number shall be recorded. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Aid to Disabled Motorists (ADV)</u>. The vehicle license number shall be recorded. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>CHP 422 (422)</u>. The vehicle license number shall be recorded. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | |
| Questions 110 through 121 pertain to the Secondary Employment review | | | | |
| 110. Does the Area have a CHP 318, Notice of Intent to Engage in Secondary Employment log? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 111. Total number of CHP 318 forms on file according to the log | 8 | | | Remarks: Eight employees are listed on the Area's secondary employment log. |
| 112. Does each log entry contain the employee's name? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 113. Does each log entry contain the employee's rank or title? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 114. Does each log entry contain the employee's ID number? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 115. Does each log entry contain the name of the employee's secondary employer? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 116. Does each log entry contain a description of the secondary employment? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 117. Does each log entry contain an emergency contact telephone number for the employee? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 118. Does the CHP 318 form contain the employee's signature and date? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 119. Is the CHP 318 form current as of the last annual evaluation? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Three CHP 318 forms have expected duration of employment dates that have expired. |
| 120. Does the CHP 318 form contain the Commander's signature and date? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 121. Does the CHP 318 form contain the Division Commander's signature and date? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM
COMMAND PERFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

| Questions 122 through 124 pertain to CHP 18 form review | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 122. Do the CHP 18, Receipt of Inconsistent and Incompatible Activities Statement forms contain the most recent and applicable revision date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Three out the 10 CHP 18 forms reviewed had an incorrect revision date. |
| 123. Is the CHP 18 form current as of the last annual evaluation? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: One CHP 18 form was dated prior to the revision date which was 05/05/2002. |
| 124. Does the CHP 18 form contain the signature, date, and ID number of both the employee and a witness? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| Questions 125 through 128 pertain to Substance Abuse Kit review | | | | |
| 125. Does the Area have two Kroll Substance Abuse Kits available and on-hand? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 126. Does the Kroll Substance Abuse Kit contain the following items: container, waybill receipt, custody and control form, specimen bag, and substance testing action checklist? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 127. Does the substance abuse kits' packaging appear to be sealed and in good condition? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: |
| 128. Are both kits are kept in a secure location and available to all supervisors and managers? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Remarks: Both kits are stored in a filing cabinet that has a lock, but it is not used because the key cannot be located. |